

6/6/70

Dick's 6/1 (Howard)

Two negative pleasures are in today's mail: a copy of Hue's sanctimonious horseshit and the Councillor approval of Sprague's compuershit. To Dick's apt comment of the Sprague attitude, Howard, I would add one thing: a total incapacity to learn anything at all from countless such experiences, each some kind of disaster, and the ultimate, major one. It is not all ego-tripping, either, for he is, without doubt, sincere and persuaded. He persuades easily, usually with no more than desire. He is in the company of the vocal majority.

Just finishing piece for Enquirer on Ray suit-Ray. Hope a responsible piece will encourage them to the thought other responsible writing is available. They asked for heat and I called Kleindienst repetitive liar and dared him to sue me, having chickened out when I sued him.

I have complete agreement with that on which I do not comment. Advice to Howard on what to include in his book is good, save for two things, both of which I've discussed with him in the past. There should be full credit, sometimes appraisals of work (not when he feels the state of his own knowledge in specialized areas may not warrant, viz Judy Bonner and Dallas Police, where I presume he has no interest, but a convenient example), and printed rather than published, as we have gone into. There may be more than my work, and, while not a book and neither legally copyrighted nor original, there is John's "copyright", which has publication as a prerequisite.

Skolnick, in order: Interestingly enough, Skolnick may have duplicated what he got from another source, for I now have what for Skolnick is his originals (and He teaches investigations!) and this phone slip has a direction to "Hazel" to send it to S SK. Bud's secretary's name is Carmen. However, Sk could have gotten it from Mosmer, Bolden's attorney.

Part time instructor: Understand, I'm not wasting the time to read Sk's suit, but he is this, at Columbia College. I now have a list of what Russ gave him and Russ's letter stipulating conditions. He also gave the COUP footnotes and our correspondence, etc. Sk used footnotes. One reason I am so interested in tapes is to see if he picked up one on my inexcusable and careless errors that I didn't catch, Paul did.

Braden-Bradley: Increasingly I come to distrust Bolden, conjecturing mental illness. I believe he fed this to Skolnick. It is significant that Bolden has mentioned no name not mentioned by Garrison. And in like context.

Excellent point on craziness of asking incompetent court to make incompetent rule on WR, which is outside purview Freedom Information act also. Almost as wierd as asking that the law under which he sues be declared unconstitutional. This can serve, but not legally, to buttress acceptance of Report.

Interesting point on quagmire. I think I use it in same sense in epilogue to WF II. I didn't think he'd read even that. As of 2/7, he knew the names of only Lane and Jones but apparently had read nothing at all.

Motive: I keep this in mind also, but as of now I have no reason to believe anything more than self-seeking. He needs publicity like you need air. Not motive but result is key. It can be very bad. My own court situation is not yet clear, but I think my major problem/cost will be transportation. The court clerk seems disposed to be helpful. I have filed pauper's oath, which eliminates all costs, fees, etc and, if there is any appeal, a transcript. Hustily,

6/6/70

Afterthought:

Because there is the possibility I will be facing Sk in court, and if I do I'll be all alone and separated from any sources, I think it desirable that I know what kinds of goodies and opinions Sprague has been feeding him. I presume you do not have copies of the correspondence, but you seem to indicate a correspondence with Sprague in which he indicates some of what he has said and sent. As a matter of fact, because there is no telling what the irresponsible Skolnick will do in court, even what he has been sent would be good to know.

He is, as you seem to understand, uncontaminated by scruples of any kind. It therefore behooves us to be prepared for any contingency. It would be a serious error to underestimate either his intelligence or his skill at dishonesty.

If anything you send should be held in confidence, please so indicate on it, so I can not err by accident.

It would also be better if this were to itself, not part of a letter dealing with other things also.

Sprague's attitudes and beliefs are hard to explain or even understand, especially because he has scientific training, has held responsible positions, and speaks softly. He is, however, underinformed and anxious to be wrong if it can foster the suggestion of any kind of conspiracy. And there are no unlikely ones to him. There is no such thing as disproof. If Garrison ever held a notion that is all Sprague needs for irrefutable proof. He still adheres to what even Garrison abandoned, like Hicks.

In short, aside from self-protection, which means protection of all of serious intent and responsible bent, I will have to be prepared to prevent any diversions by Skolnick designed to get him further publicity detrimental to truth, serious work, and any possibility of accomplishment.

And he is much less concerned about realities than even Sprague, so you can anticipate what might emerge from embroidery of the fantastic and nutty.

HW